

Tilburg University

Perceived in-group discrimination by first and second generation immigrants from different countries of origin in 27 EU Member States

André, S.C.H.; Dronkers, Jaap

Published in:
International Sociology

DOI:
[10.1177/0268580916676915](https://doi.org/10.1177/0268580916676915)

Publication date:
2017

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication in Tilburg University Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
André, S. C. H., & Dronkers, J. (2017). Perceived in-group discrimination by first and second generation immigrants from different countries of origin in 27 EU Member States. *International Sociology*, 32(1), 105-129. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0268580916676915>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Perceived in-group discrimination by first and second generation immigrants from different countries of origin in 27 EU member-states

International Sociology

1–25

© The Author(s) 2016

Reprints and permissions:

sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav

DOI: 10.1177/0268580916676915

iss.sagepub.com



Stéfanie André

Tilburg University, the Netherlands

Jaap Dronkers

Maastricht University, the Netherlands

Abstract

This article analyses perceived in-group discrimination of 29,189 first and second generation immigrant respondents from 201 different countries of origin currently living in one of 27 EU countries. In addition to testing effects of individual factors, the article estimates the effects of macro-characteristics of both origin and destination countries and community variables. The migration history of these groups is relevant for perceived discrimination: immigrants with citizenship, who speak the majority language at home and have at least one native parent perceive less in-group discrimination, whereas religious respondents, especially from religions that differ more in comparison to the majority, perceive more in-group discrimination. Furthermore, macro-characteristics of the country of origin are most important in explaining differences between European countries. Immigrants from socio-economically more developed countries with higher living standards – and for that reason more comparable to the native population – are less likely to perceive in-group discrimination.

Keywords

Country of origin, European Union, immigration, immigration policies, perceived in-group discrimination, religion

Corresponding author:

Stéfanie André, Department of Sociology, Tilburg University, PO Box 90153, 5000 LE Tilburg, The Netherlands.

Email: s.andre@tilburguniversity.edu

Introduction

Discrimination is a complex, enduring and multidimensional social and political problem for European countries, especially now that non-Western immigration is increasing. At the beginning of the 21st century due to political instability, civil wars and poverty people are leaving their home country behind and heading for Europe. This makes issues like freedom of non-Christian religions and tolerance of cultural diversity important elements in current political debates. One of the questions herein is which social and immigration policies contribute to the integration of immigrants in their destination society? We see integration as being able to participate fully in the destination society. Discrimination against minority groups and immigrants is often seen as an important explanation for their slow pace of integration and weak socio-economic, cultural and political position in European societies. Numerous projects, both on a European level and on the level of the individual member-states, aim to counter this discrimination of minorities and immigrants.

This article addresses perceived in-group discrimination by immigrants. In-group discrimination may have a significant influence on the different levels of integration of immigrants into their destination societies. Van Tubergen (2004), Kogan (2007) and Fleischmann and Dronkers (2007, 2010) have researched the participation of male and female immigrants on European labour markets as an indicator of socio-economic integration. They found significant differences between the socio-economic integration of various groups of immigrants, besides differences between countries of destination, which might, in part, be interpreted as consequences of in-group discrimination. Although there has been a lot of research in the field of social psychology on perceived in-group discrimination, until now perceived in-group discrimination of immigrants has not been analysed cross-nationally at a European level. In this analysis we therefore pose the following question: *which macro and policy factors on the levels of destination, origin and community bear influence on the perception of immigrants into the European Union towards in-group discrimination, taking into account the immigrants' individual characteristics?*

Previous research looked mainly at the effects of perceived discrimination on health and political participation, whereas research on the determinants of perceived discrimination, especially in Europe, is scarce. Research on the health effects of perceived discrimination showed a negative effect on health outcomes mediated through perceived stress and low levels of social capital (Borrell et al., 2015; Heim et al., 2011; Mewes et al., 2015; Schmit et al., 2014). As detrimental as perceived discrimination may be for both mental and physical health, negative effects have also been found on the (political) participation of immigrants. Higher levels of perceived discrimination are related to higher return intentions among refugees, to lower political confidence of immigrants in Europe, to a sense of discouragement as to political participation in Muslim-Americans, and to the low level of acculturation of Iranian refugees in the Netherlands (Di Saint Pierre et al., 2016; Oskooii, 2016; Röder and Mühlaui, 2011; Te Lindert et al., 2008).

Research on the determinants of perceived discrimination is mainly American, based on small samples and select immigrant groups. In general, it was found that perceived discrimination tends to be higher if: (1) the members of the ethnic group have more in-group support (Ruggiero et al., 1997); (2) the in-group status is higher (Taylor et al.,

1994); and (3) when in-group identification is higher (Operario and Fiske, 2001). Research on Latin America shows similar results (Canache et al., 2014). Furthermore, we are aware of only two (single-country) European studies. Among early adolescents Verkuyten (2002) found an association between ethnic identity and the experience of discrimination among minority boys in the Netherlands. While, and more recently, Alanya et al. (2015) found that second generation immigrants in Belgium experienced more group discrimination when they were more socio-economically integrated and when they perceived more threat in their city. Based on previous research, we will focus on four dimensions which are related to perceived discrimination: immigrant characteristics, religion, economy, and politics and policy.

Social psychologists like Verkuyten (2005) have signalled an increasing demand for studies that also take the historical and ideological contexts of immigration into account outside the experimental setting of the laboratory. The data of the European Social Survey, which covers all member-states of the European Union, allows for such an analysis. Our aim is therefore to contribute to the analysis of the historical and political context of in-group discrimination studies. We improve upon earlier research in three ways. First, we analyse 27 European countries instead of one or a few. Second, with this broad scope we can test the contexts of immigration by testing characteristics of countries of origin and countries of destination and can thus contribute to our understanding of what can and should be done to incorporate immigrants from certain countries of origin and which policies in the countries of destination are beneficial for their integration. Third, with over 29,000 first and second generation immigrants we have a firm statistical base for testing hypotheses on socio-economic status, religious background and immigration characteristics.

In this article, we define immigrants as all adult respondents in the European Social Survey that have at least one parent born outside the respondent's current country of residence. As a consequence of this definition, the entire cultural history of Europe – i.e. the changes of frontiers after the two world wars; the collapse of the communist regimes, forced migrations and ethnic cleansings; changing relations with (former) colonies, the influx of 'guest-workers' and asylum-seekers; growing numbers of immigrants from within the European countries – will be reflected on in the answers given by the respondents on perceived in-group discrimination in the early 21st century.

Theories and hypotheses

Most research on discrimination is based on the attitudes of the majority group towards the minority group and focused on one country or a small group of countries (e.g. Devine, 1989; Verkuyten, 2005). Some studies have compared the majority group's attitudes across several countries (e.g. Kunovich, 2004; Schneider, 2008; Semyonov et al., 2008). Few studies have analysed the attitudes of the minority group towards the majority or other minority groups and these studies are generally situated in one country (Bobo and Hutchings, 1996; Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., 2006; Verkuyten, 2002, 2005). As far as we know, there have been no studies of perceived in-group discrimination of immigrants in a comparative European perspective, using a comparable dataset for all EU member-states.

There is hardly any literature on cross-national differences in (perceived) in-group discrimination, therefore this research – the theory and hypotheses – although based on intergroup contact theory, which is an often used theory in research into discrimination and interethnic relations,¹ is of an exploratory nature.

Intergroup contact theory

Intergroup contact theory is one of the oldest and most influential theories about intergroup relations, such as the discrimination of minorities by majorities (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew, 1998). The theory states that interpersonal contact is beneficial for positive intergroup relations, and thus diminishes negative attitudes, at least when five conditions are met: equal status between groups, common goals to be reached, intergroup cooperation, support of laws and customs and the potential for friendship. The theory predicts discrimination to be minimal when intergroup contact is maximal. Many investigations in the US as well as in Europe empirically support this (Di Saint Pierre et al., 2016; Pettigrew and Tropp, 2006).

We use two assumptions derived from intergroup contact theory on which to base our hypotheses: (1) if the chances of more and more equal contact between immigrants and natives are greater, this induces less experienced discrimination of immigrants; (2) less experienced discrimination of immigrants will induce less reported perceived in-group discrimination. The logic behind this is that if there is more contact between immigrants and natives, both (might) develop more positive attitudes towards the other group. When the majority has a more positive attitude towards immigrants, we expect them to discriminate less and therefore we expect immigrants to perceive less discrimination.

Rejection of our hypotheses can mean two things. First, it is possible that one or both of these assumptions are incorrect. It might be that contact does not have positive but negative consequences, as expected by competition theory,² or leads to more awareness of discrimination. Second, it is possible that contact with natives leads to discriminatory practices, for example ‘subtle’ racial remarks by natives.

In the next sections we distinguish the four dimensions in which we categorized our hypotheses: immigration, religion, economy and politics and policy. Within each of these dimensions we will formulate hypotheses on four levels of analysis: individual, community, country of destination and country of origin. The national context of destination countries affects perceptions of immigrants as shown in the case of prejudice (Semyonov et al., 2008), and thus these national contexts can also influence immigrants’ likelihood to perceive in-group discrimination. Several studies also showed that the country of origin influences integration (Fleischmann and Dronkers, 2007; Levels et al., 2008; Van Tubergen, 2004) and thus might also affect immigrants’ likelihood of perceiving in-group discrimination. For these reasons, we believe that it is important to take all these four levels into account.

Immigration hypotheses

Various characteristics of immigration may influence the nature of and the opportunities for contact with the native population. First, we expect immigrants that have lived longer

in the country of destination have more opportunities for contact with natives. Furthermore, second generation immigrants were born in their parents' destination country and have therefore relatively more opportunities for equal contact with the native population (Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., 2006). These immigrants have been raised in the country of destination and attended its educational system, two factors that enhance the opportunities of establishing equal contact. We therefore expect that *second generation immigrants perceive in-group discrimination less often*.

We expect that when immigrants are more like the native population the possibilities of equal contact are greater. If the immigrant is a citizen of the destination country he/she is assumed to be more like the native population with respect to values and behaviour. Citizenship in most countries of the European Union must be earned by means of an examination of the candidate's knowledge of the values and the language of a country. Having command of the language and values increases the possibility of contact with natives, and we also expect it will equalize it. On the other hand, we expect the possibility of contact with the native population to be reduced if the immigrant speaks a minority language at home, especially if this minority language is spoken outside the home as well. Research shows that the educational performance of immigrant children increases when their parents speak the majority language as well (Levels and Dronkers, 2008). Therefore we expect the language proficiency to be higher in general when immigrants speak the majority language at home. A third possibility that increases contact opportunities is if one's parents have a mixed marriage, e.g. if one parent is native-born and the other is foreign-born. We therefore expect that *immigrants that are not citizens of the destination country and that speak a minority language or that do not have a native parent perceive in-group discrimination more often*.

The opportunities of immigrants to establish contact are not only individually determined. Different groups of immigrants integrate at different levels, as has been found in earlier research (Fleischmann and Dronkers, 2007; Van Tubergen, 2004). Cultural distance could be important since a larger cultural distance is associated with less mutual understanding (Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., 2006) and will thus reduce positive contact. We therefore expect that *members of a community with a greater cultural distance to their destination country perceive in-group discrimination more often*.

Group size can also affect contact with natives. As first proposed by Williams (1947) and later tested by various researchers (Hagendoorn, 1993; Semyonov et al., 2008) the larger the minority the less benevolent it appears. Larger groups are more visible and induce less mutual understanding and thus less contact with natives. Schlueter and Wagner (2008) show that the regional size of the immigrant population within EU member-states indeed decreases contact with natives; Canache et al. (2014) also find support for this hypothesis in Latin America. For this reason we expect that *the larger the size of a specific immigrant community in their destination country, the more often members of this community perceive in-group discrimination*.

Religion hypotheses

Individual religion has become less important in most European countries, shown by increasing secularization since the Second World War (Need and De Graaf, 1996). This

seems to be less the case for immigrants from outside (Western) Europe. For Muslims, the honour of the prophet and their religion is very important (Modood, 2004). Comparable mechanisms might be true for other non-Christian religions, because their adherents might be treated by native (former) Christians with more suspicion, as was found for Canadian Muslims (Litchmore and Safdar, 2014). Moreover, the civil wars in the former Republic of Yugoslavia in the 1990s could also be described as wars between Christian and non-Christian groups (Bosnian Muslims) or between Western and Eastern Christianity (Orthodox Serbs versus Catholic Croats). Religions can clash with each other and with non-religious populations. Since immigrants more often adhere to a non-Christian religion, we expect this to reduce contact with natives. Furthermore, religious attendance can also be important. Immigrants that are adherents of a religion but do not go to a church, mosque or synagogue very often may be seen as less different to natives than adherents of a religion who go to these places very often. Thus we expect that *immigrants who are adherents of a non-Christian religion perceive in-group discrimination more often, and immigrants who are more integrated into their religious community will perceive in-group discrimination more often.*

Another aspect is religious distance. More distance in religiosity to natives can reduce contact with natives and thus induce discrimination. When the distance between natives and immigrants with respect to religiosity is greater, we expect this to reduce contact for every immigrant, regardless of the individual religion or religious integration, since natives might judge all immigrants of that community to be religiously distant. Therefore we expect that *immigrants who belong to a community with a greater religious distance to their destination country perceive in-group discrimination more often.*

The religion of the country of origin might influence immigrants, but might also influence the reactions of natives towards these immigrants. Fleischmann and Dronkers (2007) found that immigrants who come from non-Christian countries of origin had worse labour market outcomes than comparable immigrants from prevalently Christian societies. The same mechanism is expected for perceived discrimination. For example, a Christian Iraqi immigrant may have less contact with natives, because natives think that he is a Muslim. This results in the expectation that *immigrants who come from non-Christian countries of origin perceive in-group discrimination more often.*

Economy hypotheses

The economic dimension is important for our research, because contacts between natives and immigrants are more easily made at school and at work. We focus on three aspects: education, employment and occupational status. Highly educated persons tend to discriminate less (or they are more subtle in their discriminatory practices). Because they have more contact with highly educated natives, highly educated immigrants might perceive less in-group discrimination, as found in previous research (Canache et al., 2014; Jasinskaja-Lathi et al., 2006); although Alanya et al. (2015) found the opposite for two Belgian cities. An additional argument is that highly educated immigrants have more opportunities to be successful in their new country, which induces equal contact. Also, employment and a higher occupational status can positively influence the extent and

equality of the contact between natives and immigrants. That is why we expect *immigrants who are more successfully integrated economically to perceive in-group discrimination less often*.

The socio-economic distance of the immigrant community to the natives of the destination country was found to be the most significant characteristic in predicting education and labour market outcomes of immigrants (Levels et al., 2008; Van Tubergen, 2004). As with religious distance, we therefore expect *that immigrants of a specific community with a greater socio-economic distance to their destination country perceive in-group discrimination more often*.

Immigrants from poorer countries differ more from European natives and these immigrants have more difficulty in meeting natives and contact with natives might be less equal. Therefore we expect *that immigrants who originate from countries with poorer economies perceive in-group discrimination more often*.

Politics and policy hypotheses

Many characteristics of the country of destination can influence the mutual contact immigrants and natives have.³ We focus on two aspects: laws and labour markets. First the laws: in countries with a higher level of openness and inclusiveness immigrants might feel more welcome and less discriminated against. The conflicts between immigrants and natives are less present, contact is stimulated and on a more equal basis, and the perceived in-group discrimination is lower. We therefore expect *that immigrants who live in a destination country with more inclusive policies perceive in-group discrimination less often*.

Second, the labour markets of destination countries can vary in the level of openness for outsiders. We expect that in countries with better employment protection (at least in legislation) the jobs of the insiders (mostly natives) are better protected against outsiders like immigrants (Fleischmann and Dronkers, 2007; Kogan, 2007). This indicates that contact between natives and immigrants will arise less often and less equally, and can even induce conflicts. Such conflicts have given rise to group discrimination at work, as showed by Duckitt (1992). That is why we expect *that immigrants who live in a destination country with higher employment protection legislation perceive in-group discrimination more often*.

Data and measurements

We use waves 2 to 6 of the integrated data file of the European Social Survey (ESS) for our analysis (ESS1e06_4).⁴ The data were collected between 2004 and 2012 (ESS, 2012). The dataset contains information on very diverse topics, among which are perceived in-group discrimination for over 291,000 respondents in European countries. We selected only the 27 EU member-states (at that time), because we are especially interested in the effects of immigration and social policies on integration of immigrants and reliable and comparable indicators of these policies are only available for EU member-states.

Measurement of immigrants

We classified respondents as immigrants if at least one of the parents of the respondent was born outside the country of residence. For first generation immigrants the country of birth is used as country of origin. For second generation immigrants we used the country of birth of the mother, or if not available of the father. This gives us 201 countries of origin. Because not all identifiable countries of origin are represented by substantial numbers of surveyed immigrants in the ESS, we merged countries into regions if the number of immigrants from these countries in our sample was smaller than 10. The pooled ESS dataset contains 29,189 non-native respondents, varying from 130 from Italy to 3174 from Estonia. These immigrants are distributed across 120 countries and 11 regions of origin, varying from 7 immigrants who originated from the region of Southern Africa to 3919 immigrants from the former USSR, as can be seen in Tables 1 and 2.

A problem, however, with this measurement strategy lies in the changing national boundaries in Europe over the entire 20th century and the start of the 21st century. Due to changes in political frontiers after 1918 (the restructuring of Central and Eastern Europe) and 1945 (the annexation by Poland of some formerly German territory; the extension of Russia at the expense of Polish territory) and due to the subsequent displacement of large populations, an unknown number of 'indigenous' persons are measured as being born outside their country, e.g. a German respondent or his/her parents born in Königsberg (East Prussia) and now living in Germany or a Polish respondent or his/her parents born in Lvov (Ukraine) and now living in Poland. We could add more examples of this border-changing in recent times for Yugoslavia and the USSR. One can argue that by failing to make the distinction between genuine immigrants and border changes, we overestimate the number of better-integrated immigrants. At the same time, this possible failure highlights a conceptual problem in defining an immigrant: for how many generations must a Polish family live in Germany before he/she is no longer considered Polish? This issue also extends to the large number of 'visible minority' natives, whose grandparents migrated from former colonies to Europe. They are not included in this analysis, but might suffer from the same ethnic and racial discrimination as 'new' immigrants. For example, Sikhs who are British or Canadian nationals have sought exemption from motor-cycle helmet laws and official dress codes for police forces, in order to be able to wear their turban (Kymlicka, 1995); this visibility might induce discrimination.

Another problem of using the ESS for comparative analyses of immigrants is the selectivity of the migrants in the ESS sample. As the ESS is not specifically designed to include immigrants, they most probably have a legal status in the country to be in the sampling frame and because participation requires language proficiency, the immigrants that are in the sample need to speak the language of the destination country.⁵ This selectivity of established immigrants in the ESS might be undesirable, but at this moment the ESS data are the best available for a European comparative analysis and are used more and more often in comparative immigration research (e.g. Röder and Mühlau, 2011). Moreover, we should keep in mind that if significant and substantial effects are found for these legal, more well-established immigrants, the effects are probably even larger with the less-integrated and undocumented immigrants that are not included in the survey.⁶

Table 1. Number and percentage of natives and immigrants who perceive in-group discrimination on one of the five grounds (language, race, nationality, ethnicity or religion) per destination country.

Country	Number of natives and % perceiving discrimination		Number of immigrants and % perceiving discrimination	
	N	(%)	N	(%)
Austria	3914	0.7	709	13.0
Belgium	7162	0.9	1677	10.7
Bulgaria	8065	5.6	245	3.3
Croatia	2585	1.5	506	4.0
Cyprus	4043	0.8	358	12.8
Czech Republic	8471	1.1	718	7.1
Denmark	6921	0.7	847	10.2
Estonia	5870	1.6	3174	19.7
Finland	9761	1.3	333	11.4
France	7642	1.6	1841	12.2
Germany	12,110	0.7	2255	9.4
Greece	6239	1.7	918	19.2
Hungary	7670	3.6	392	2.8
Ireland	9418	0.9	1551	9.3
Italy	2350	0.9	130	10.8
Lithuania	3378	1.6	338	10.1
Luxembourg	840	0.8	778	4.9
Netherlands	7864	1.8	1341	16.5
Norway	7160	1.2	856	6.5
Poland	8311	0.9	354	1.4
Portugal	10,201	0.5	697	19.1
Slovakia	8123	2.6	526	4.4
Slovenia	5643	0.7	1126	3.4
Spain	8883	1.6	982	15.0
Sweden	7254	0.7	1760	8.8
Switzerland	5793	0.6	2929	7.0
United Kingdom	9339	5.2	1848	15.0
Total	185,010	1.7	29,189	11.2

Source: Unweighted data from waves 2 to 6 of the European Social Survey.

Dependent variable: Perceived in-group discrimination

Our measurement of perceived discrimination is based on five theoretical grounds that indicate perceived in-group discrimination based on immigrant status: language, race, nationality, ethnicity and religion. When a respondent indicated that the experienced in-group discrimination was based on any of these grounds he/she scored a (1). Because these are so-called formative items, we cannot test their measurement equivalence (Saris

Table 2. Total number of immigrants and percentage of those immigrants who perceive in-group discrimination on one of the five grounds (language, race, nationality, ethnicity or religion) per country or region of origin.

Country of origin	N	% Perceived discrimination	Country of origin	N	% Perceived discrimination
Mali	12	58.3	Mauritius	34	20.6
Gambia	11	54.5	Lebanon	64	20.3
Sao Tome and Principe	18	44.4	Turkey	1052	20.1
French-speaking Caribbean	16	43.8	Congo-Kinshasa	58	19.0
Nigeria	126	42.1	Algeria	398	18.8
Ivory Coast	26	38.5	Bulgaria	153	18.3
Ghana	54	37.0	China	131	18.3
Netherlands Antilles	44	36.4	New Zealand	22	18.2
Haiti	11	36.4	Columbia	83	18.1
Albania	316	36.1	Mexico	28	17.9
Guyana	12	33.3	Cape Verde	148	17.6
Togo	12	33.3	Russia	3910	17.3
Ethiopia	27	33.0	Angola	186	17.2
Guinea	32	31.3	Sri Lanka	99	17.2
Cameroon	26	30.8	Hong Kong	18	16.7
Guinea-Bissau	13	30.8	Moldova	48	16.7
Eastern Asia	13	30.8	Western Asia	24	16.7
Morocco	631	29.8	Egypt	92	16.3
Pakistan	242	29.8	Vietnam	94	16.0
Senegal	47	29.8	Eritrea	26	15.4
Uganda	17	29.4	Madagascar	26	15.4
Western Africa	34	29.4	Armenia	40	15.0
Jamaica	96	29.2	Bolivia	48	14.6
Congo-Brazzaville	93	29.0	Ecuador	96	14.6
Afghanistan	55	27.3	Israel	21	14.3
Middle Africa	11	27.3	India	384	14.3
Palestine Territories	30	26.7	Rwanda	14	14.3
Kenya	31	25.8	Zimbabwe	28	14.3
Suriname	124	25.8	Southern Africa	7	14.3
Iran	151	25.2	Chile	85	14.1
Tunisia	159	25.2	Greenland	22	13.6
Bangladesh	52	25.0	South Africa	81	13.6
Iraq	182	24.2	Kosovo	44	13.6
Libya	13	23.1	Dominican Republic	37	13.5
Somalia	61	23.0	Thailand	68	13.2
Sudan	22	22.7	Peru	77	13.0
Azerbaijan	27	22.2	Ukraine	645	13.0
Brazil	283	21.6	Eastern Africa	31	12.9
Syria	67	20.9	Malaysia	32	12.5
Canada	89	12.4	Hungary	392	4.6

Table 2. (Continued)

Country of origin	N	% Perceived discrimination	Country of origin	N	% Perceived discrimination
Spanish-speaking Caribbean & South America	33	12.1	Argentina	91	4.4
Lithuania	125	11.2	Czech Republic	541	4.4
Western Europe	9	11.1	United States	442	4.3
Cuba	37	10.8	Greece	266	4.1
Philippines	131	10.7	Estonia	75	4.0
Mozambique	57	10.5	Faroe Islands	27	3.7
Tanzania	10	10.0	Germany	1988	3.5
Ireland	347	9.5	Finland	573	3.0
Uruguay	21	9.5	Switzerland	105	2.9
Romania	682	9.2	France	911	2.9
Aruba	11	9.1	United Kingdom	1054	2.9
Cambodia	11	9.1	Italy	1473	2.9
English-speaking Caribbean	22	9.1	Venezuela	36	2.8
Poland	1249	8.2	Belgium	271	2.6
Yugoslavia	2429	8.0	Czechoslovakia	117	2.6
Japan	38	7.9	Iceland	41	2.4
Slovakia	556	7.4	Sweden	248	2.4
Singapore	14	7.1	Austria	480	2.3
Latvia	133	6.8	Spain	440	2.3
North Korea	15	6.7	Netherlands	392	1.8
Paraguay	15	6.7	Denmark	228	1.3
Indonesia	258	6.6	Slovenia	75	1.3
South-East Asia	32	6.3	Luxembourg	27	0
Cyprus	40	5.0	Malta	16	0
Portugal	602	5.0	Norway	200	0
Australia	63	4.8	Total	29,189	11.2

Source: Unweighted data from waves 2 to 6 of the European Social Survey.

and Stronkhorst, 1984). When we order the countries of origin and destination, in Tables 1 and 2, on percentage perceived discrimination this is in the expected direction, which gives face validity for our measure.

Table 1 reveals how many natives and immigrants per destination country say that they belong to a group which experiences in-group discrimination for any of the five reasons. The table shows that this percentage is almost always higher for immigrants than for natives. The mean percentage of perceived in-group discrimination among immigrants in these European Union countries is 11.2%, while only 1.7% of the natives in these societies perceive such in-group discrimination. This large difference in perceived discrimination between natives and immigrants supports our assumption that the measurement is valid. The highest percentage of perceived in-group discrimination among immigrants is found in Estonia (19.7%) and the lowest in Poland (1.4%).

The high score for Estonia can be explained by its large Russian-speaking minority, who immigrated by force during the Soviet occupation of Estonia, and perceive discrimination after the downfall of the Soviet Union and the breakaway of Estonia from Russia. The highest percentages of natives perceiving in-group discrimination live in Bulgaria (5.6%) and in the UK (5.2%) and the lowest percentage (0.5%) in Portugal. The high score of natives feeling discriminated against in the UK might be accounted for by the 'visible third generation minorities', mainly from former colonies, which we cannot distinguish in our sample. For Bulgaria these are mainly third generation Turks, which comprise a relatively large minority in Bulgaria, as well as Roma, who are native to the country, however discriminated against.

Table 2 gives the percentages of immigrants per country or region of origin who say that they belong to a group which experiences in-group discrimination in their society of destination. The countries or regions of origin are in order of these percentages. The resulting rank order is not very surprising: immigrants from outside Europe perceive far more in-group discrimination (on average 20.1%) than immigrants coming from inside Europe (on average 6.0%). The highest in-group discrimination is found among immigrants from Mali and Gambia and the lowest among immigrants from European countries like Luxembourg, Malta and Norway.⁷ This gives some extra support for our assumption that proximity might be an indicator of less perceived discrimination.

Independent variables

Table 3 presents descriptive statistics on the variables used. We coded as (1) if the respondent had citizenship, spoke a non-official language at home and if the parents had a mixed marriage. Furthermore, we used Hofstede's (1984) individualism scale for a measurement of cultural distance at the community level: the level of individualism of the country of origin was subtracted from the level of individualism in the country of destination. A larger score indicated a larger distance. Group size is the number of immigrants in the community (number of immigrants of origin A in destination B). We have 1198 different immigrant communities in our dataset, running from 1 to 2631 members.

Religion is measured by eight dummy variables indicating if a respondent was not religious or an adherent of the Roman Catholic, Protestant, Eastern Orthodox, other Christian, Jewish, Islamic, Eastern or other non-Christian religion. Religious practice was measured as the mean of religious attendance and praying. At the community level we measured religious distance by subtracting the mean level of religious practice of an immigrant group from the mean level of religious practice of the natives in that country.

Furthermore, we created dummy variables to indicate the prevalent religion of the country of origin. If at least 50% of the population belonged to the same religious group, this religion was classified as prevailing. If no religious group reached this 50%, the country was classified as having no prevalent religion; or if Christian religions reached a majority it was classified as prevalently Christian. We distinguished prevalently Christian, Islamic, Eastern religious and other non-Christian countries. Data are from the CIA World Factbook (2008).

Educational level is measured on a five-point scale from not completed primary education (0) to tertiary education (4). A dummy variable was made indicating if someone is

Table 3. Descriptive information about the individual and macro-characteristics of the 29,189 immigrants.

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
<i>Immigration</i>				
Perceived in-group discrimination	0.00	1.00	0.12	0.31
Second generation	0.00	1.00	0.47	
Citizen destination country	0.00	1.00	0.70	
Minority language	0.00	1.00	0.29	
Mixed marriage	0.00	1.00	0.37	
Cultural distance in individualism	-64.00	78.00	14.62	21.58
Relative community size	0.01	29.07	4.98	8.26
<i>Religion</i>				
Not religious	0.00	1.00	0.33	
Roman Catholic	0.00	1.00	0.30	
Protestant	0.00	1.00	0.11	
Eastern Orthodox	0.00	1.00	0.11	
Other Christian religion	0.00	1.00	0.03	
Jewish	0.00	1.00	0.00	
Islam	0.00	1.00	0.09	
Eastern religions	0.00	1.00	0.02	
Other non-Christian religions	0.00	1.00	0.01	
Religious practice	1.00	7.00	3.04	1.80
Religious distance	-4.84	3.68	-0.25	0.77
Origin – Christian	0.00	1.00	0.70	
Origin – Islam	0.00	1.00	0.15	
Origin – Eastern religious	0.00	1.00	0.03	
Origin – other non-Christian	0.00	1.00	0.12	
<i>Economy</i>				
Educational level	1.00	5.00	3.19	1.33
Employment	0.00	1.00	0.89	
Occupational status (ISEI)	11.01	88.96	41.81	21.57
Socio-economic distance	-3.13	2.44	-0.09	0.49
GDP per capita origin (per US\$1000)	0.50	55.60	19.86	12.73
HDI origin	0.29	0.97	0.83	0.12
<i>Politics & policy</i>				
MIPEX Labour market access destination	25.00	100.00	61.82	16.75
MIPEX Family reunion destination	32.00	92.00	58.16	13.56
MIPEX Long-term residence destination	39.00	76.00	59.93	9.89
MIPEX Political participation destination	13.00	93.00	51.58	23.06
MIPEX Access to nationality destination	21.00	71.00	44.70	15.52
MIPEX Anti-discrimination destination	23.00	94.00	57.50	22.67
MIPEX total destination	37.00	88.00	55.68	12.46
Employment protection legislation	0.50	3.74	1.90	0.87
<i>Control</i>				
Age	13.00	98.00	44.78	17.60
Female	0.00	1.00	0.53	

Source: Unweighted data from waves 2 to 6 of the European Social Survey.

in paid employment. We used ISEI for occupational status. At the community level we subtracted the mean level of education of the immigrant group from the mean level of education of the natives for socio-economic distance.⁸ We used GDP per capita and the Human Development Index for the state of the economy (CIA World Factbook, 2008); higher scores indicate better living conditions.

The last domain is politics and policy. The Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX) is a measurement of how countries are promoting integration of immigrants. They do this by coding the different policies which are helpful in the integration process. It uses over a hundred policy indicators on six areas or subscales (Niessen et al., 2007).⁹ Higher scores represent better policies on a scale from 0 to 100. We used as well the total scale as the six subscales for long-term residence, access to nationality, anti-discrimination policy, family reunion, political participation and labour market access.

The index of employment protection legislation (EPL) measures the openness of labour markets of destination countries to outsiders. A higher score indicated better employment protection for those in the destination country who are employed. We derived data from the OECD (2007), using the average of 1990, 1998 and 2003.

Age is computed from the birth year and women score (1) on the variable female. Missing values are categorized in a 'missing values' category or excluded from the analysis. By including age we can measure how many years of their life someone has spent in the country of destination and in the country of origin. People who have lived here longer *and* a longer part of their life, are expected to resemble natives the most. For second generation immigrants, who have lived in the destination country their whole life, this increases the likelihood that they resemble natives.

Results

In order to take into account the non-hierarchical nested structure of our data we use cross-classified multilevel analysis. This model makes it possible for respondents to be nested both into countries of origin and into countries of destination. Given the dichotomous nature of our dependent variables (whether or not belonging to a group which is discriminated against in society) we apply logistic multilevel analysis, which means that the variance at the individual level is fixed to 1.

We start with an empty model ('null-model'). The (not shown) null-model shows that there is significant variance in perceived in-group discrimination at all three levels: the origin level: 0.850 (SD 0.146), the destination level 0.177 (SD 0.089) and the community level 0.282 (SD 0.047). The deviance of the null-model is 17703.

The results for immigration expectations

The first model in Table 4 shows the immigration characteristics that can influence perceived in-group discrimination. Second generation immigrants, as well as citizens of the destination country and those who have one native parent are less likely to perceive discrimination, while those who speak a minority language at home are more likely to perceive discrimination. This means that opportunities for contact with natives have a

Table 4. Unstandardized coefficients and (standard errors) of logistic cross-classified multilevel analyses of perceived in-group discrimination of immigrants in EU member-states.

	Level	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
<i>Immigration</i>						
Second generation	1	-.173* (.056)				-.124* (.055)
Citizen	1	-.370* (.050)				-.368* (.050)
Minority language	1	.401* (.053)				.334* (.051)
Mixed marriage	1	-.836* (.064)				-.727* (.064)
Cultural distance	2	.014* (.003)				-.001 (.003)
Group size	2	.014 (.013)				.018 (.015)
<i>Religion</i>						
No religion (ref.)	1					
Roman Catholic	1		-.149* (.066)			-.166* (.070)
Protestant	1		-.106 (.090)			-.031 (.094)
Orthodox	1		.695* (.072)			.430* (.071)
Other Christian	1		.383* (.114)			.304* (.120)
Jewish	1		1.532* (.237)			1.459* (.241)
Islam	1		.811* (.084)			.518* (.091)
Eastern religions	1		.039 (.168)			-.214 (.165)
Other non-Christian	1		.929* (.197)			.773* (.198)
Religiosity	1		.073* (.013)			.050* (.014)
Religious distance	2		-.164* (.044)			-.055 (.045)
Christian origin (ref.)	30					
Eastern religions origin	30		.564* (.244)			.255 (.190)
Islamic origin	30		.547* (.154)			.128 (.143)
Other non-Christian	30		.329 (.240)			-.016 (.170)
<i>Economy</i>						
Educational attainment	1			.042* (.018)		.040* (.018)

(Continued)

Table 4. (Continued)

	Level	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Employed	1			.285* (.087)		.338* (.087)
Occupational status	1			-.004* (.001)		-.001 (.001)
Occupational status missing				.041 (.073)		.009 (.076)
Socio-economic distance	2			.057 (.059)		.019 (.058)
GDP origin	3O			-.040* (.005)		-.026* (.007)
HDI origin	3O			-1.594* (.275)		-1.217* (.256)
<i>Policy & politics</i>						
MIPEX Long term residence	3D				.000 (.004)	.002 (.004)
MIPEX Access to nationality	3D				.006 (.007)	.006 (.008)
MIPEX Anti-discrimination	3D				-.006 (.006)	-.003 (.003)
MIPEX Family reunion	3D				-.025* (.006)	-.007 (.006)
MIPEX Political participation	3D				.004 (.003)	-.001 (.004)
MIPEX Labour market access	3D				.012* (.003)	.006 (.005)
EPL	3D				.140 (.079)	-.110 (.101)
<i>Control</i>						
Age	1	-.018* (.001)	-.015* (.001)	-.015* (.001)	-.014* (.001)	-.019* (.001)
Women	1	-.049 (.041)	-.102* (.040)	-.048 (.039)	-.075 (.039)	-.045 (.042)
Constant	1	-1.342* (.147)	-2.159* (.120)	-.109* (.034)	-1.309* (.187)	-.787* (.344)
Destination variance	3O	.203* (.083)	.131* (.057)	.146* (.071)	.114* (.055)	.133* (.059)
Origin variance	3D	.378* (.081)	.331* (.080)	.242* (.070)	.617* (.103)	.090* (.039)
Community variance	2	.155* (.039)	.234* (.047)	.251* (.048)	.231* (.045)	.154* (.035)
-2loglikelihood		17064	17336	17597	17629	16894

Source: Unweighted data of waves 2 to 6 of the European Social Survey.

Nimmigrants = 29,189; Ncommunities = 1198; Ndestination = 27. Parameters for dummies of waves and missing occupational status not shown.

*significance at the .05 level. 1 = individual, 2 = community, 3O = origin country 3D = destination country.

positive influence, as expected. At the community level we tested the cultural distance and the group size hypotheses. In model 1 cultural distance is significant. This means that immigrants from culturally more distant countries (less individualistic than natives of the destination country) perceive in-group discrimination more often. However, it is no longer significant in the full model (5) when controlled for variables from the other domains. Group size is not significant in either model.

The fit of the model increased considerably by 639 points (6 df) in the immigration model. The variance at the origin level decreased from 0.850 to 0.378 by 55% and remains significant, the destination variance increases by 15% and the community variance decreased by 45%.

Results for religion expectations

The religion dimension contains variables at three levels: individual, community and country of origin. Model 2 shows that Jewish, Islamic, Orthodox Christians, other Christians and other non-Christian respondents perceive in-group discrimination more often than non-religious immigrants. It also shows that Catholic immigrants perceive in-group discrimination less often than non-religious immigrants, while there is no significant deviance for Protestants or adherents of Eastern religions. This indicates that religions which differ more from the Latin-Christian majority, perceive in-group discrimination more often, as was expected. The finding that adherents of Eastern religions do not perceive in-group discrimination more often than non-religious respondents can be explained by their different perception of or reaction on perceived in-group discrimination (Sue and Okazaki, 1990). We also find that more religious immigrants perceive in-group discrimination more often. At the community level we find in model 2 that immigrants from countries that are more religiously distant from the destination country more often perceive in-group discrimination. However, this religious distance is not significant in the final model. We also tested the effects of the dominant religion of the country of origin and expected that non-Christian dominant religions (that differ more strongly from the religion in the EU destination country) increase the perceived in-group discrimination. Although we find this to be the case for immigrants from prevalently Eastern religious countries and Islamic countries in model 2, the effects disappear in the final model. The religion variables decreased the fit by 367 points compared to the null-model and the variance at the origin level decreased by 61%, while the variances at the community and destination levels decreased by 17% and 26%. This indicates that a different religious composition of the immigrants in a destination country accounts for a quarter of the differences between European countries.

Results for economy expectations

Model 3 shows that higher educated respondents perceive in-group discrimination more often, which is contrary to our expectation. An explanation is that higher educated immigrants perceive more in-group discrimination because they interact more

with natives and thus may better observe the underprivileged situation of their own group. The other two variables do have the expected direction, at least in model 3. Employed respondents perceive in-group discrimination less often in model 3 and in the final model, respondents with a higher occupational status also perceive less in-group discrimination in model 3, but not in the final model. We do not find an effect for socio-economic distance, but the two origin macro variables GDP per capita and HDI are significant and negative in model 3 and the final model. This means that immigrants from wealthier economies (higher GDP and HDI) perceive in-group discrimination less often than immigrants from 'poorer' countries of origin. This is in line with our hypothesis that immigrants with a large economic gap to the country of destination more often perceive in-group discrimination. The fit decreased by 106 points (6 df) compared to the null-model. The variance at the country of origin level decreased by 72% compared to the null-model, the decreases for the destination level (18%) and community level (11%) are lower.

Results for politics and policy expectations

The dimension integration policy only contains destination variables. The policies based on long-term residence, access to nationality, anti-discrimination and political participation do not have an effect on perceived in-group discrimination. Only family reunion integration policy has the expected negative effect on in-group discrimination. However, immigrants in countries of destination with more inclusive labour market policies perceive in-group discrimination more often. This might indicate that these immigrants enter the labour market more easily and thus might experience more employment-related discrimination as a group. However, these two indicators are not significant in the final model. Furthermore, we do not find an effect for employment protection legislation (EPL). Our politics and policy domain explains the least of the variation in perceived in-group discrimination of all four domains. The fit increased by 74 points (7 df) and the variance at the destination level decreased considerably by 36%, which is the level on which the hypotheses are based.

Results of the final model

The final model, in which we included the variables of all four domains, explains a lot about the variance in perceived in-group discrimination: the fit increased by 809 points compared to the null-model, and the variance at the origin level decreased by 85% to 0.090, whereas we could explain 45% at the community level and 25% at the destination level. Both second generation immigrants and immigrants with citizenship that have a native parent; that speak the majority language at home; are employed; originate from a country with a high GDP or living standard perceive less in-group discrimination. Adherence to Orthodox or other Christian, Jewish, Islamic, or other non-Christian religions and a higher educational level increase the perception of in-group discrimination. The control variables show that, on average, older immigrants perceive less in-group discrimination than younger immigrants, whereas no gender gap was found.

Conclusion and discussion

In this study we analysed the perceived levels of in-group discrimination of 29,189 immigrants in 27 EU countries. We used a logistic cross-classified multilevel model to answer our main question: *which macro and policy factors on the levels of destination, origin and community bear influence on the perception of immigrants into the European Union towards in-group discrimination, taking into account the immigrants' individual characteristics?*

The first conclusion is that, in comparison with the native population, immigrants indicate far more often that they belong to a group which is discriminated against in society, be it for their language, race, nationality, ethnicity or religion. This higher amount of perceived in-group discrimination is not self-evident, because most immigrants that participated in the European Social Survey are well-established (following the fact that they could fill in the survey in the national language and were willing to participate). This perceived in-group discrimination is not the same as personally experienced discrimination. The precise relation between the former and the latter needs further study; however, it seems likely that this relation is positive, though not very strong. If this positive relation does indeed exist, our study suggests that discrimination against immigrants in the EU takes place, and that it varies mostly as a function of country of origin and individual characteristics of the immigrant, and less as a function of the country of destination.

In analysing perceived in-group discrimination, as with other immigrant-related subjects, the double comparison, in which both the country of origin and the country of destination are included, is important. We find that effects of policy and politics are less influential when we take characteristics of the individual, community and country of origin into account. Without controlling for these other variables wrong conclusions might be reached on the effects of policy.

We explained the perceived in-group discrimination across four domains of variables (immigration, economy, religion, politics and policies) based on intergroup contact theory: immigrants who have more contact opportunities with natives were expected to perceive less in-group discrimination. We found that immigration characteristics such as citizenship, speaking a minority language at home and having a native parent were the most powerful explanations, which all relate to immigration background. We also found that immigrants from wealthier economies perceived in-group discrimination less often than immigrants from 'poorer' countries of origin, which was the second best explanation. Adherence to religions that differ more from the majority religion(s) also explained variance in perceived in-group discrimination, but less than immigration characteristics.

We should note that not all of our findings are in line with intergroup contact theory. This can be explained in two ways. First, it might be that our two assumptions on the relationship between characteristics, contact and perceived in-group discrimination are not correct. It is possible that more equal contact leads to more perceived in-group discrimination, since immigrants become more aware of (subtle) discrimination. Second, it might be possible that intergroup contact theory is not the only or the best theory to explain perceived in-group discrimination. Intergroup contact theory has been criticized

by critical race theorists (CRT), who state that it is unable to capture the 'everyday experience of people of colour' (Delgado and Stefancic, 2012). Other societal processes like the increasing ethnic identification of immigrants, competition between immigrants and natives' enhanced awareness of discrimination in general may influence perceived in-group discrimination. This would be in line with the finding of Verkuyten (2005) that immigrants with a stronger ethnic identity report more in-group discrimination.

Particularly notable is the effect of educational attainment; the higher the educational level, the higher the perceived in-group discrimination. This result suggests that more highly educated immigrants are more aware of social exclusion, as they face more discrimination in the labour market where they compete with highly-educated natives, or they are more aware of the discrimination of their group for example from the media, which is in line with the work of Alanya et al. (2015). A possible explanation is that immigrants have far lower returns to their education in terms of access to the most prestigious jobs, which shows that the gap between immigrants and natives in labour market attainment is especially large among this group (Fleischmann and Dronkers, 2007).

The strong influence of adherence to Eastern Orthodox, Jewish, Islamic and other non-Christian religions on perceived in-group discrimination is a remarkable finding, because the fault line does not run between Christian and non-Christian religions but follows the schism between the western and eastern Christian churches of 1054. Thus, it is important to underline that Muslims are not the only religious group that perceive in-group discrimination more often: Jews perceive the highest level, followed by adherents of non-Christian religions, Muslims and the Eastern Orthodox Church. This means that it is not a simple contradiction between Islam and Christian religions that induces perceived in-group discrimination. It should be noted that adherents of Eastern religions (Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism) do not perceive in-group discrimination more often than the non-religious immigrant. Because it is implausible that these adherents are not discriminated against in the EU (in most cases they are a visible minority and experience no less discrimination; Modood, 2004: 94), the adherents of Eastern religions might ignore the occurrence of in-group discrimination and focus on their individual success (Sue and Okazaki, 1990).

Migration history is also relevant: immigrants who are citizens, speak the majority language at home, and have a native parent perceive in-group discrimination less often than immigrants who do not have these characteristics although they originate from the same countries and live in the same countries. These effects of migration history can probably (partly) be explained by selectivity: those who really want to live in the country of destination will probably get citizenship faster, might marry a native, speak the national language more often and ignore or not encounter in-group discrimination. But it might also be possible that these choices made in the migration history have their own dynamic, for instance natives might treat immigrants with citizenship less discriminatively than immigrants who are still more connected to their origin culture.

We have found that policy did not influence perceived in-group discrimination after controlling for individual characteristics (composition). We can thus conclude that the differences in perceived in-group discrimination in the European destination countries

are mainly due to differences in immigrants' countries of origin and their own individual characteristics, whereas differences in the destination countries themselves hardly contribute to the explanation of perceived in-group discrimination.

Our analysis showed that a cross-national analysis of immigrant discrimination can be very fruitful and that such an analysis will be flawed if the immigrants' countries of origin are not incorporated, and that the religious dimension should not be ignored. In the short run, our results might be less a cause for self-congratulation for the European societies, but unpleasant social facts ignored will become dangerous in the long run.

Acknowledgements

We want to thank Fenella Fleischmann, Ellen Jansen, Janneke Sierksma-Zwaan and participants in several workshops and conferences for their contributions to this article.

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Notes

1. We only analysed the perceived in-group discrimination of immigrants in Europe, not the discrimination of other minorities in European societies. These religious, cultural and ethnic minorities do still exist in Europe: Swedish speakers in Finland; German speakers in Belgium, Denmark and Italy; Danish speakers in Germany; Basques and Catalonians in Spain. However, their level of perceived discrimination cannot be studied with the European Social Survey.
2. Competition theory is often used together with intergroup contact theory to explain interethnic relations. We chose to focus on one of the two theories (contact) so as to develop a parsimonious set of hypotheses. If the competition theory was also used, contradictory hypotheses for almost all of our hypotheses could be developed.
3. For more variables at the country of destination level, the Appendix can be requested from the corresponding author.
4. The first wave of the European Social Survey is not usable for our purposes, because we do not know the countries of origin of the second generation immigrants.
5. The survey was conducted in the official languages of the countries of destination and in languages which are spoken by at least a 5% minority of the population (e.g. Russians in Estonia).
6. However of course we do not know if these immigrants perceive more or less in-group discrimination than the (more established) interviewed respondents.
7. The Appendix gives the precise combination of natives and immigrants per country of origin and destination.
8. We use education instead of occupational status or income because of the substantially lower number of missing cases of the education variable.
9. An example of policy which is examined is family reunion. For the UK a change in the family reunion policies is noted: 'Separated families now face the least "family-friendly" immigration policies in the developed world: the longest delays and highest income, language and fee levels, one of the few countries with language test abroad and restricted access to benefits' (www.mipex.eu/united-kingdom, accessed 24 September 2016).

References

- Alanya A, Baysu G and Swyngedouw M (2015) Identifying city differences in perceived group discrimination among second-generation Turks and Moroccans in Belgium. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 41: 1088–1110.
- Allport GW (1954) *The Nature of Prejudice*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bobo L and Hutchings VL (1996) Perceptions of racial group competition: Extending Blumer's theory of group position to a multiracial social context. *American Sociological Review*: 951–972.
- Borrell C, Palència L, Bartoll X et al. (2015) Perceived discrimination and health among immigrants in Europe according to national integration policies. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 12: 10687–10699.
- Canache D, Hayes M, Mondak JJ et al. (2014) Determinants of perceived skin-color discrimination in Latin America. *The Journal of Politics* 76: 506–520.
- CIA (Central Intelligence Agency) (2008) *The 2008 World Factbook*. Available at: www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/ (accessed February 2008).
- Delgado R and Stefancic J (2012) *Critical Race Theory: An Introduction*. New York: New York University Press.
- Devine PG (1989) Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 56: 5–18.
- Di Saint Pierre F, Martinovic B and de Vroome T (2016) Return wishes of refugees in the Netherlands: The role of integration, host national identification and perceived discrimination. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 41: 1836–1857.
- Duckitt JH (1992) *The Social Psychology of Prejudice*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers/Greenwood Publishing.
- European Social Survey Data (2012) ESS Integrated Data file edition ESS1e06_4: Norwegian Social Science Data Services, Norway – Data Archive and distributor of ESS data.
- Fleischmann F and Dronkers J (2007) The effects of social and labour market policies of EU-countries on the socio-economic integration of first and second generation immigrants from different countries of origin. EURSCAS Working paper 2007/19 (European Forum Series). Available at: <http://hdl.handle.net/1814/6849>
- Fleischmann F and Dronkers J (2010) Unemployment among immigrants in European labour markets: An analysis of origin and destination effects. *Work, Employment and Society* 24: 337–354.
- Hagendoorn L (1993) Ethnic categorization and outgroup exclusion: Cultural values and social stereotypes in the construction of ethnic hierarchies. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 16: 26–51.
- Heim D, Hunter C and Jones R (2011) Perceived discrimination, identification, social capital and well-being: Relationships with physical health and psychological distress in a U.K. minority ethnic community sample. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 42: 1145–1164.
- Hofstede G (1984) *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*. London: SAGE.
- Jasinskaja-Lahti I, Liebkind K and Perhoniemi R (2006) Perceived discrimination and well-being: A victim study of different immigrant groups. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology* 16: 267–284.
- Kogan I (2007) *Working Through Barriers*. New York: Springer.
- Kunovich RM (2004) Social structural position and prejudice: An exploration of cross-national differences in regression slopes. *Social Science Research* 33: 20–44.
- Kymlicka W (1995) *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Levels M and Dronkers J (2008) Educational performance of native and immigrant children from various countries of origin. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 31: 1404–1425.
- Levels M, Dronkers J and Kraaykamp G (2008) Educational achievement of immigrants in Western countries: Origin, destination, and community effects on mathematical performance. *American Sociological Review* 73: 835–853.
- Litchmore RV and Safdar S (2014) Perceptions of discrimination as a marker of integration among Muslim-Canadians: The role of religiosity, ethnic identity, and gender. *Journal of International Migration and Integration* 16: 187–204.
- Mewes R, Asbrock F and Laskawi J (2015) Perceived discrimination and impaired mental health in Turkish immigrants and their descendants in Germany. *Comprehensive Psychiatry* 62: 42–50.
- Modood T (2004) Capitals, ethnic identity and educational qualifications. *Cultural Trends* 13: 87–105.
- Need A and De Graaf ND (1996) ‘Losing my religion’: A dynamic analysis of leaving the church in the Netherlands. *European Sociological Review* 12: 87–99.
- Niessen J, Huddleston T and Citron L (2007) Migrant Integration Policy Index. Available at: www.britishcouncil.org/netherlands-networks-mipex-report.pdf (accessed February 2008).
- OECD (2007) *OECD Factbook 2007*. Available at: http://stats.oecd.org/wbos/default.aspx?DatasetCode=EPL_1 (accessed February 2008).
- Operario D and Fiske ST (2001) Ethnic identity moderates perceptions of prejudice: Judgments of personal versus group discrimination and subtle versus blatant bias. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 27: 550–561.
- Oskooii KA (2016) How discrimination impacts sociopolitical behavior: A multidimensional perspective. *Political Psychology* 37: 613–640.
- Pettigrew TF (1998) Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology* 49: 65–85.
- Pettigrew TF and Tropp LR (2006) A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 90: 751–783.
- Röder A and Mühlau P (2011) Discrimination, exclusion and immigrants’ confidence in public institutions in Europe. *European Societies* 13: 535–557.
- Ruggiero KM, Taylor DM and Lydon JE (1997) How disadvantaged group members cope with discrimination when they perceive that social support is available. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 27: 1581–1600.
- Saris WE and Stronkhorst LH (1984) *Causal Modelling in Nonexperimental Research: An Introduction to the LISREL Approach*. Amsterdam: Sociometric Research Foundation.
- Schlueter E and Wagner U (2008) Regional differences matter examining the dual influence of the regional size of the immigrant population on derogation of immigrants in Europe. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 49: 153–173.
- Schmitt MT, Branscombe NR, Postmes T and Garcia A (2014) The consequences of perceived discrimination for psychological well-being: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin* 140: 921–948.
- Schneider SL (2008) Anti-immigrant attitudes in Europe: Outgroup size and perceived ethnic threat. *European Sociological Review* 24: 53–67.
- Semyonov M, Rajzman R and Gorodzeisky A (2008) Foreigners’ impact on European societies public views and perceptions in a cross-national comparative perspective. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 49: 5–29.
- Sue S and Okazaki S (1990) Asian-American educational achievements: A phenomenon in search of an explanation. *American Psychologist* 45: 913–920.
- Taylor DM, Wright SC and Porter LE (1994) Dimensions of perceived discrimination: The personal/group discrimination discrepancy. In: *The Psychology of Prejudice: The Ontario Symposium, Vol. 7*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, pp. 233–255.

- Te Lindert A, Korzilius H, Van de Vijver FJ et al. (2008) Perceived discrimination and acculturation among Iranian refugees in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 32: 578–588.
- Van Tubergen F (2004) *The integration of immigrants in cross-national perspective. Origin, destination and community effects*. Utrecht: ICS Dissertation Series.
- Verkuyten M (2002) Perceptions of ethnic discrimination by minority and majority early adolescents in the Netherlands. *International Journal of Psychology* 37: 321–332.
- Verkuyten M (2005) Ethnic group identification and group evaluation among minority and majority groups: Testing the multiculturalism hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 88: 121–138.
- Williams RM (1947) The reduction of intergroup tensions: A survey of research on problems of ethnic, racial, and religious group relations. *Social Science Research Council Bulletin*.

Author biographies

Stéfanie André is a PhD student in sociology at Tilburg University (the Netherlands); the subject of her thesis is the social and political implications of home ownership. This article is the result of her internship with Professor Jaap Dronkers at the European University Institute.

Jaap Dronkers held the Chair of International Comparative Research on Educational Performance and Social Inequality, at the Research Centre for Education and the Labour Market, Maastricht University until his passing in 2016.

Résumé

Nous avons analysé la discrimination perçue à l'encontre de leur endogroupe par 29.189 personnes interrogées qui sont des immigrés de première ou deuxième génération originaires de 201 pays et vivant actuellement dans l'un des 27 pays de l'Union européenne. Outre les effets que peuvent avoir les facteurs individuels, nous évaluons les effets des macro-caractéristiques à la fois du pays d'origine et du pays d'accueil, et les variables communautaires. L'histoire migratoire de ces groupes influe sur la discrimination perçue : les immigrés ayant acquis la citoyenneté dans le pays d'accueil, qui parlent la langue majoritaire à la maison et comptent au moins un membre de la famille natif du pays d'accueil, perçoivent une discrimination à l'encontre de leur endogroupe moins importante, tandis que les personnes interrogées qui sont religieuses (en particulier pour les religions qui se distinguent le plus de la majorité) perçoivent une discrimination envers leur endogroupe plus importante. Par ailleurs, les macro-caractéristiques du pays d'origine revêtent une importance particulière pour expliquer les différences entre les pays européens. Les immigrés originaires de pays socialement et économiquement plus développés avec un niveau de vie plus élevé, et donc d'un niveau plus proche de celui de la population du pays d'accueil, sont moins susceptibles de percevoir une discrimination à l'encontre de leur endogroupe.

Mots-clés

Discrimination perçue dans l'endogroupe, immigration, pays d'origine, politique d'immigration, Union européenne

Resumen

Este artículo analiza la discriminación percibida del endogrupo de 29.189 inmigrantes de primera y segunda generación encuestados de 201 países de origen diferentes que actualmente viven en uno

de los 27 países de la UE. Además de testar el efecto de factores individuales, se estima el efecto de las macro-características de los países de origen y destino y de variables a nivel de la comunidad. La historia migratoria de estos grupos es relevante para la percepción de la discriminación: los inmigrantes que poseen la ciudadanía, que hablan la lengua mayoritaria en casa y tienen al menos un progenitor nativo perciben menos discriminación del endogrupo, mientras que los encuestados religiosos, especialmente de las religiones que difieren más en comparación con la mayoría, perciben más discriminación del endogrupo. Por otra parte, las macro-características del país de origen son de gran importancia para explicar las diferencias entre los países europeos. Los inmigrantes de los países socio-económicamente más desarrollados con altos niveles de vida, y por ello más comparables a la población nativa, son menos propensos a percibir discriminación del endogrupo.

Palabras clave

Discriminación percibida en el endogrupo, inmigración, país de origen, políticas de inmigración, Unión Europea